

REMARKS

Claims 3-6, 8-10 and 41-44 are pending in the application. Claims 3-6, 8-10, 41 and 42 have been amended. Claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 43 and 44 are newly added. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action has objected to the drawing as not showing or numbering the "voids" recited in the claims. The drawing has been amended, subject to the approval of the Examiner, with a replacement sheet that contains Fig. 26 with voids or holes having reference numerals 200 for patterns 26A through 26G and reference numeral 202 for pattern 26H. Therefore, it is submitted that the objection to the drawing is obviated.

The specification has been amended at page 13 to refer to the voids 200 and 202 in Fig. 26. The specification has also been amended at page 14 to change "contact196" to "contact 196".

The Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,381,134 to Anselmo et al., hereafter Anselmo.

This rejection is moot since claim 1 has been canceled.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,528,072 to Kurosawa et al., hereafter Kurosawa.

This rejection is moot since independent claim 1 has been canceled and dependent claims 4 and 5 have been amended to depend from new claim 44.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, 5 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,181,385 to DeSantis et al., hereafter DeSantis.

This rejection is moot since independent claim 1 has been canceled and dependent claims 4 and 5 have been amended to depend from new claim 43 and dependent claim 41 has been amended to depend from claim 3.

The Office Action rejects claims 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,562,462 to Matsuba et al., hereafter Matsuba et al., hereafter Matsuba.

Claim 6 has been amended to recite a carrier with an electrically conductive via disposed between first and second opposed surfaces thereof and a first electrical contact button that is disposed on the first surface of the carrier in electrical contact with the via. Matsuba's socket contacts 32 are disposed in Matsuba's unmarked conductive via and not on the first opposed surface of the carrier 20. Claim 6 has also been amended to recite a second electrical contact button that is disposed on the second opposed side of the carrier. Matsuba has no second electrical contact as claimed. Therefore, Matsuba lacks the above noted deficiencies.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Matsuba is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Matsuba in view of U.S Patent No. 4,902,606 to Patraw, hereafter Patraw.

This rejection is moot since independent claim 1 has been canceled and dependent claim 3 has been amended to depend from new claim 43.

The Office Action cites a number of patents that were not applied in the rejections of the claims. These patents have been reviewed, but are believed to be inapplicable to the claims.

Newly presented claim 43 recites a carrier with at least one electrically conductive via disposed between first and second opposed surfaces thereof and a first electrically conductive contact button that is disposed on the first surface in electrical contact with the via and that covers an opening of the via in the first surface. None of the cited references discloses an electrically conductive contact button disposed on a surface of the carrier and that is in electrical contact with the via and that covers the via. Claim 44 is dependent on claim 43 and recites a second electrically contact button disposed on the second opposed surface of the carrier. None of the cited references discloses first and second buttons on opposed first and second surfaces of the carrier. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 43 and 44 distinguish from the cited art and are, therefore, allowable.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the objection to the drawing be withdrawn, that the rejections under U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn, that claims 3-6, 8-10 and 41-44 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 3-29-06



Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
(203) 327-4500

U.S. Serial No. 10/715,288
Attorney Docket No. YOR920030496US1

APPENDIX A

IN THE DRAWING

Please replace sheet 21/22 of the drawing with the replacement sheet appended hereto in Appendix A.